REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 25-31, 35 and 37-56 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of October 30, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response no claims are amended, added or cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 4, on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-10, 13-14, 25-31, 35, 37-47 and 50-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berggren (WO 00/44130) in view of Turtiainen (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,407) and Bilgic et al. (U.S. Patent no. 6,097,817). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to clarify that a mobile client receives a subscriber identity sent from a mobile station, and the subscriber identity corresponds to a subscriber of a mobile telecommunication network. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, alone or in combination, at least fail to disclose or suggest receiving at a mobile client a subscriber identity sent from a mobile station, as recited in claim 1.

Berggren is directed to providing services on an Internet Protocol based network using an existing user authentication functionality applied from a digital cellular radio communication network. In Berggren, a user users a mobile station (162) to access a gateway node of a cellular communication network (120), the mobile station (162) contains an IC card (16) that stores subscriber information relating to a subscription to a cellular radio communication network. See Berggren page 10, lines 10-14; page 9, lines 29-31. The user may also use a second terminal (164), i.e. a personal computer (PC) to access the Internet (110). In order to authenticate activities provided by the internet connection, the user obtains a password from a gateway node (100) of the cellular communication network. See Berggren page 12, lines 6-7. The password received by the user is a Temporary PIN code (TPIN) that is associated with the MSISDN of the user. See Berggren page 13, lines 2-5. The TPIN is used by the user during the internet session with the Internet server (13) being accessed using the second terminal (164) by entering the MSISDN as user id and TPIN as password in response to prompting by the server (130). See page 13, lines 17-20. This is performed using the second terminal (164). However, in contrast

to claim 1, the subscriber identity, i.e. MSISDN is never sent from the mobile station (162) to the second terminal (164), but is instead entered by the user into the second terminal (164). As can be seen in Figure 1 of Berggren, there is no communication between the second terminal (164) and mobile station (162).

The Office asserts on page 3 of the Office Action that Berggren does disclose receiving at the client the subscriber identity sent from the mobile station. However, the Office states that the SIM card (160) is a part of the terminal (262). Claim 1 specifically recites that the mobile station is separate from the mobile client, and therefore it is irrelevant that the terminal (262) in Berggren receives the subscriber identity from the SIM card (160), because the SIM card (160) is not separate from the terminal (262), as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Berggren at least fails to disclose or suggest receiving at the mobile client the subscriber identity sent from the mobile station, wherein the mobile station is separate from the mobile client as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Turtiainen fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Berggren, because Turtiainen also fails to disclose or suggest receiving at a mobile client a subscriber identity sent form a mobile station. While applicant acknowledges that Turtiainen discusses that the mobile station (1) and user interface (16) may directly communicate with each other through a suitable operational connection, Turtiainen never discloses or suggests that the subscriber identity is ever sent to the user interface (16), whether input by the user or through an operational connection. Instead, Turtiainen only discloses that transactions can be acknowledged by sending the details of the transaction to the MS PAD (35) to ensure correctness by means of a checksum calculated by the MS PAD (35) in accordance with a predefined algorithm and utilizing the secret of the SIM (34). See Turtiainen column 9, lines 59-65. The checksum has to match with the sum displayed by the user terminal (16). However, the sum displayed by the user terminal (16) is transmitted by the application to the user terminal, and is not provided by the mobile station (1), either directly or through user input. See Turtiainen column 8, lines 60-65 (application retrieves user related authentication data from an appropriate database and sends a text message to the mobile station). Therefore, Turtiainen also fails to disclose or suggest receiving at the mobile client the subscriber identity sent from the mobile station, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, applicant respectfully submits that the motivation offered by the Office to combine the teachings of Berggren and Turtiainen is insufficient. The Office asserts that

inclusion of the features from Turtiainen is motivated by freeing a user from using a separate authentication device. However, Turtiainen itself solves the problem used as the motivation by the Office by using a mobile phone as an authentication aid in a similar manner as an embodiment of Berggren. Therefore, since each reference alone provides a sufficient solution for using a mobile phone and/or SIM authentication the motivation offered by the Office to combine Berggren and Turtiainen is insufficient. As such, there is no motivation to combine the cited references, and as discussed above, even if the references were combined the subject matter of claim 1 would not be produced.

Bilgic does not make up for the deficiencies identified above with respect to the teachings of Berggren and Turtiainen. Therefore, since the cited references individually fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1, it necessarily follows that even if the references are combined they will also fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Instead, Bilgic is directed to a communication system having a wireless trunk for connecting multiple phone lines over wireless communication links to a cellular network that includes a central telephone switch connected through one or more trunk lines to a wireless access communication unit. Bilgic does not disclose or suggest receiving at a mobile client a subscriber identity sent from a mobile station, where the mobile station is separate from the mobile client, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Bilgic fails to make up for the deficiencies recited in claim 1, and the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. See MPEP § 2143.03.

Furthermore, the Office states that inclusion of the teachings of Bilgic is motivated by further providing authentication and security in a mobile wireless communication system. Bilgic discloses a GSM gateway type wireless access device, e.g. a PABX, for connecting to a GSM network. The PABX is connected to the wireless access device by trunk lines, and each trunk corresponds to a subscription in the GSM network, having an associated SIM. Each trunk is authenticated to the GSM network by a respective SIM using standard GSM authentication. Therefore, Bilgic discloses authentication to a GSM network using GSM authentication, which is inherently present in both Berggren and Turtiainen, since the mobile stations of Berggren and Turtiainen are communicating with a mobile communication network. As such, there is no need to add further authentication to the teachings of Berggren and Turtiainen. Furthermore, the authentication mechanisms disclosed by Bilgic are similar to the authentication techniques of

Berggren and Turtiainen, therefore Bilgic does not provide for any additional teachings with respect to the cited references. Therefore, for at least this additional reason, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Independent claims 13, 25, 30, 35, 37, 38 and 50 all contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claims 13, 25, 30, 35 37, 38 and 50 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to these claims.

Claims 2-10, 14, 26-29, 31, 39-47 and 51-56 all ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 5, on page 10 of the Office Action, claims 11-12 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berggren in view of Turtiainen and Bilgic, and in further view of Lightman (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,414). Claims 11-12 and 48-49 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the forgoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fee deficiency required to submit this response to Deposit Account No. 23-0442.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 21 December 2007

s/Keith R. Obert/
Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone:(203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
Customer No. 004955